



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

[Signature]
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/054,633	01/22/2002	Niall R. Lynam	DON01 P-962	5792

28101 7590 08/30/2006

VAN DYKE, GARDNER, LINN AND BURKHART, LLP
2851 CHARLEVOIX DRIVE, S.E.
P.O. BOX 888695
GRAND RAPIDS, MI 49588-8695

EXAMINER

NEGRON, ISMAEL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2875

DATE MAILED: 08/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/054,633	Applicant(s) LYNAM ET AL.	
	Examiner Ismael Negron	Art Unit 2875	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ismael Negron, Examiner.

(3) Dr. Niall Lynam, Applicant.

(2) Timothy A. Flory (Reg. 42,540).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 22 August 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: N/A.

Claim(s) discussed: 130.

Identification of prior art discussed: U.S. Pat. 5,671,996 (BOS et al.) and National Semiconductor LM78S40 (NSC).


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Dr. Lynam discussed the disclosure of BOS et al. pointing out its relevance and scope within the art at the time of invention. BOS et al., according to Dr. Lynam, was concerned with providing low-level illumination for making the vehicle interior (e.g. controls, levers, knobs, and the like) visible without causing glare to a vehicle driver. Dr. Lynam's assessment of the intention of BOS et al. is supported by, for example, column 2, lines 7-26 of such reference. BOS et al. discloses an LED lamp structure formed by an LED, a cylindrical adaptor 94 open at one end for telescopically receiving the LED, and a lens 100 closing a second open end of the adaptor 94. A power resistor 92 is used by BOS et al. to reduce the operating voltage of the vehicle to that required by the LED.

Dr. Lynam argued that one of ordinary skill in the art would not, in light of BOS et al., find it obvious to replace the LED of BOS et al. with a high-current high-intensity power LED, since doing so would generate large quantities of heat which the patented structure would not be capable of dissipating. The claimed voltage conversion element delivers the required high power input to the LED without having to dissipate as much power as the resistor 92. Dr. Lynam further argued that the claimed invention presented in a single convenient package what BOS et al. features in a plurality of separate elements. Dr. Lynam referred to applicant's Figure 25 as an exemplary embodiment of the claimed invention. The Examiner agreed with all of Dr. Lynam arguments, specifically those relating to the limitations of the patented device of BOS et al. to physically incorporate the claimed high power LED and voltage conversion element, however, argued that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been more than capable of overcoming such limitations motivated by the goal of using a brighter light source. The Examiner expressed his opinion that the claimed invention basically took prior art structure and arranged them together in a single integrated package. Dr. Lynam agreed that the instant invention is not directed to each of its elements individually, but to the particular combination and arrangement of such elements. The Examiner agreed that the claimed combination is novel and that it does provide some advantages over prior art devices, but still believed the instant invention, as defined by the claims, to be an obvious "next step" in light of the general knowledge in the art.

Dr. Lynam expressed the willingness of the applicants to further limit the scope of the claims. The Examiner suggested deleting some of the functional language limitations and adding more structure recitations.

Dr. Lynam asked if the Examiner would agree to review additional amendments before they are officially filed. The Examiner agreed to put together claimed language that would reflect what the Examiner considers as allowable limitations and fax them to Mr. Flory for consideration. September 8, 2006 was agreed as the date by which the Examiner should fax the proposed language to Mr. Flory..